(30)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक ..... सन् 200

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अंतिम आदेश

S.B. HON. SHRI JUSTICE DHIRENDRA MISHRA, J

Cr.M.P.No. 337 of 2007

Applicants

1. Smt. Tameshwari Goswami, aged about 40 yrs, W/o Hiragir Goswami.
2. Rewti Raman @ Pranjal Goswami, aged about 15 yrs, s/o Hiragir Goswami, minor through natural guardian mother Smt. Tameshwari w/o Hiragir Goswami.

Both r/o Nayapara ward, Bhatapara, P.S/P.O./Tahsil Bhatapara, Distt. Raipur (C.G.)

VERSUS

Non-applicants

Hiragir Goswami, aged about 62 yrs, s/o Shubhgir, r/o Anderson gali, Torwa Basti, Bilaspur, P.O./P.S./Tah./ Distt. Bilaspur, C.G.

29.8.2007

Shri B.M. Rao, counsel for the applicants.

Heard.

The applicants by the instant petition under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. have impugned the order dated 17.5.2007 passed by Additional Sessions Judge, Bhatapara in criminal revision

GRPRJ — FS/246— 2/2007 — 50,000

(31)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक ..... सन् 200

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश 2.	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अंतिम आदेश
	No. 18/07 whereby the learned Additional Sessions Judge, has confirmed the order dated 27.11.2006 passed in Misc. Criminal Case No. 79/06 passed by Judicial Magistrate First Class, Bhatapara. Grievance of the applicants is that they had moved an application under Section 125 of the Cr.P.C. for maintenance against the non-applicant and the same was disposed of on the basis of compromise entered into between the parties way back in the year 1998 as the non-applicant deposited a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- towards maintenance of the applicants. However, subsequently an application under Section 127 of the Cr.P.C. was filed by the applicants for enhancement of the amount on the ground that the interest accruing on the amount, so deposited, as per compromise between the parties, is not sufficient for their livelihood and therefore suitable enhancement should be made. The above application was rejected by the trial Court with an observation that since maintenance proceedings were disposed of on the basis of compromise, the applicants could be awarded additional maintenance only on the basis of compromise and the above finding was subsequently confirmed by the impugned order.	

GRPRJ — FS/246—2/2007 — 50,000.

(32)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक..... **सन् 200**

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश ३	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अंतिम आदेश
	After going through the orders passed by both the Courts below, this Court is of the considered opinion that there is no illegality or infirmity in the impugned order which warrants interference in exercise of jurisdiction under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. Accordingly, the petition being devoid of substance is dismissed at the admission stage itself. **Sd/-** **Dhirendra Mishra** **Judge**	

GRPRJ — FS/246— 2/2007 — 50,000.